

Gender Equality and Biblical Justice: Scriptural Critique of Outcome Parity

Sixbert Sangwa*¹

¹Office of the President, Open Christian University, California, The United States

*Author: ssangwa@openchristian.education

CITATION

Sangwa S. (2025). Gender Equality and Biblical Justice: Scriptural Critique of Outcome Parity. *Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology (OJ-SPT)*. Vol 01. Issue 02. Open Christian Press.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17170637>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 19 September 2025

Published: 21 September 2025

Category: Normative Theological-ethics Article

COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2025 by author(s).

Open Journal of Science, Philosophy & Theology (OJ-SPT) is published by Open Christian Press. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

PUBLISHER INFO

Open Christian Press—the publishing arm of Open Christian University—is produced in partnership with the Center for Faith and Work.

Disclaimer: The views expressed are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect their institutions.

Abstract: Contemporary gender-equality campaigns often claim to empower women through numeric parity, yet Scripture grounds justice in impartial access, vocation-sensitive stewardship, and covenantal love. Drawing on panel data across seven nations and theological anthropology, this article argues that rights-first rhetoric can dehumanise and devalue women by recasting them as interchangeable production units who must replicate male trajectories, thereby eroding the distinct relational good of being cherished wives, mothers, and collaborative leaders, and their vocational witness. An illustrative four-member committee, elected through neutral procedures yet comprising four women, demonstrates that uneven outcomes can embody justice when they reflect Spirit-distributed gifts rather than demographic engineering. Using triangulated UN and OECD indicator metadata, measurement-theory handbooks, and meta-analyses on gender representation and performance, the study shows parity metrics invite Goodhart effects, tokenism, and mission drift. We conclude that churches, academies, and policymakers should retain descriptive statistics but pair them with transparent process audits and vocation-centred evaluations to cultivate neighbour-loving institutions.

Keywords: gender equality; biblical justice; outcome parity; spiritual gifts; Goodhart's law; composite indicators; policy evaluation.

1. Introduction: Problem, Thesis, Method: In policy discourse, gender equality is often operationalized through representation percentages in offices, boards, or committees, especially under the Sustainable Development Goal framework and regional indices that track women's share of seats or leadership posts (UN Women/UN DESA, 2024; United Nations Statistics Division, 2024). The thesis of this article is that such outcome-parity proxies risk misidentifying justice. Scriptural justice affirms equal dignity and impartial access while permitting uneven outcomes because divine gifts and callings differ across persons and communities, and these differences matter for institutional excellence and neighbor-love (Gen 1:27–28; Rom 12:4–8; 1 Cor 12:4–7; 1 Pet 4:10). Methodologically, I conduct an integrative review of high-quality secondary sources: UN and OECD indicator frameworks and metadata, the EIGE Gender Equality Index methodology, measurement-theory handbooks, and peer-reviewed economics and management research on gender representation and organizational performance, reported according to best-practice principles for evidence integration (Page et al., 2021; UN Women/UN DESA, 2024; UNSD, 2024.)

2. Clarifying Equality vs. Outcome Parity:

Equality admits different senses. Philosophers of justice distinguish equality of opportunity and of capabilities from equality of outcomes. Sen argues that what matters is people's substantive freedoms to achieve valued functionings, not identical achievements (Sen, 1995). Roemer formalizes equality of opportunity as neutralizing circumstances beyond a person's control so that outcomes depend on choice and effort (Roemer, 1998; Roemer & Trannoy, 2015). Policy metrics that collapse justice into headcounts in offices conflate equality of access with parity of results. From a biblical perspective, equal dignity and impartiality before God and law are nonnegotiable (Jas 2:1–9), yet Scripture neither promises nor prescribes symmetry of outcomes across all roles in the body of Christ or civic life (1 Cor 12:14–20; Sen, 1995; Roemer, 1998; Roemer & Trannoy, 2015.).

3. Thought Experiment: Four-Member

Committee: Suppose a committee of four is elected under procedures that ensure equal eligibility, publicity, and freedom to stand. Only women offer candidacies that satisfy the role's competency profile, and all four are elected. The outcome is 100 percent female. If equality is defined as equal access and impartial process, justice is satisfied even though the result is uneven. Forcing male inclusion to achieve parity would violate impartiality and instrumentalize persons by subordinating vocation to a numerical target. The moral question is therefore about the fairness of procedures and the discernment of gifts, not the symmetry of results. This is consistent with equality-of-opportunity accounts and with Scripture's account of differentiated yet coordinated service (Roemer, 1998; Roemer & Trannoy, 2015; Sen, 1995; 1 Cor 12:18; Rom 12:6). A parallel case arises in vocational distribution: equal access may still yield gender-skewed cohorts—e.g., male-majority technical institutes and female-majority hospitality programs—without constituting injustice. What matters is that the admissions process remains impartial and that curricula respect genuine aptitudes (*Ex 35:30–35*). Forcing quota-driven placements would stifle calling, diminish performance, and violate the Pauline principle that “*God has arranged each one of the parts...just as He wanted*” (1 Cor 12:18; Keller & Alsdorf, 2012).

4. Biblical Foundations: Creation, Gifts,

Vocation: Creation teaches that men and women share equal dignity as divine image-bearers while being created with difference ordered to fruitfulness and stewardship (Gen 1:27–28). Contemporary equality discourse often collapses difference into deficiency, yet Scripture portrays differentiation as intrinsic to worship. From the diverse tones of human skin (*Song of Songs 1:5–6*) to the multiplicity of gifts distributed “as He wills” (1 Cor 12:11), the Creator delights in variety (Piper & Grudem, 1991). Attempts to enforce uniform outcomes—whether by gender, ethnicity, or socio-economic status—risk denying God's providential ordering and fostering resentment rather than gratitude (*Rom 12:3–6*; Keller & Alsdorf, 2012). Justice, therefore, is measured by faithfulness to one's allotted stewardship, not by numerical sameness (1 Cor 7:17). The New Testament frames the church as a body in which the Spirit distributes diverse gifts for the common good (1 Cor 12:4–7; 1 Pet 4:10–11). Scholarly exegesis has long emphasized unity-in-diversity across these passages and the ordering of gifts to edification (Smalley, 1968; see also discussions on the scope of Gal 3:28 as soteriological equality rather than role flattening). Theological treatments of Gal 3:28 note its significance for equal standing in Christ while warning against overextending it to erase every vocational distinction in church or society (Vorster, 2019). Justice, on this account, honors impartiality and calling rather than mandating identical distributions of roles (Smalley, 1968; Vorster, 2019).

Creational Diversity and Providential

Vocation: Classical Christian thought holds that variety in gifts and social stations magnifies divine wisdom (Aquinas, *ST I-II*, q.96, a.3). Modern justice theories, by contrast, often abstract from vocation, treating persons as interchangeable resource holders whose value lies in symmetrical shares (Rawls, 1999). Yet Scripture links identity and telos: each individual is “created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared ahead of time” (*Eph 2:10*). These works vary—some administrative, some manual, some intellectual—and the Spirit equips accordingly (1 Pet 4:10–11). Justice, therefore, is vocational alignment plus neighbor-love, not outcome parity. This framing re-centers policy

assessment on barrier removal and gift discernment, aligning with Sen's capability approach while grounding capabilities in creational intention (Sen, 1995).

5. Theological Anthropology and Justice:

Scripture's theological anthropology ties personhood to relation and vocation. Persons are oriented to God and neighbor, and institutions exist to facilitate ordered love that seeks the neighbor's good (Matt 22:37–40). Paul's body metaphor teaches coordinated differentiation: one body, many members, each placed by God for service (1 Cor 12:18–27). Justice therefore requires eliminating partiality while discerning aptitudes and callings that may be unevenly distributed across time, places, and tasks. This theological horizon is consistent with capability-based public reasoning about equal substantive freedom, yet it reframes telos around worship and service (Sen, 1995; Roemer & Trannoy, 2015).

6. Gender-Equality Rhetoric, Relational Goods, and the Paradox of Devaluation:

Contemporary gender-equality discourse, though aspiring to liberate women from unjust constraints, often deploys a rights-first grammar that abstracts persons from the covenantal texture of marriage and kinship. When "empowerment" becomes synonymous with competitive parity, women risk being recast as units of production whose worth rises or falls with identical outcomes—an anthropological slippage that Scripture resists by rooting dignity in God's image and vocation in self-giving love (Gen 2:18; Eph 5:28). Sangwa and Mutabazi (2025a) trace how global compliance regimes enthrone rule-following as the supreme competence, thereby encouraging women to prove value through box-ticking conformity rather than through the freely reciprocated affection that marks a beloved wife. Their companion study on the "spiritual code" of governance shows that such metric-centric paradigms follow a Luciferian logic that instrumentalises bodies for ideological ends (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025b).

Empirical evidence corroborates the relational cost. A seven-country panel (1995–2025) finds that landmark equality-rights statutes trigger a short-run spike of 0.4–0.5 percentage-points in divorce prevalence—an unintended fallout the authors dub the

"rights-cohesion paradox" (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025c). Large-scale dyadic analysis likewise shows that relationship satisfaction falls when women adopt more egalitarian attitudes than their husbands, yet rises when the attitudinal lead is reversed or when both partners share clear, complementary role visions (Park et al., 2025). Together these findings suggest that the quest to mirror male trajectories can, paradoxically, erode the distinct relational capital wives uniquely steward—namely, the power to be cherished for covenantal devotion rather than competitive sameness.

Theologically, equality rhetoric that prizes outcome symmetry over covenant fidelity obscures the missionary telos of womanhood as a divine gift "perfectly suited" to complete the man (Gen 2:22–23 CSB). Mission-Driven Learning Theory further reminds us that human flourishing depends on aligning competence with mission, not with mimetic parity (Sangwa & Mutabazi, 2025d). Justice, therefore, must protect women's equal dignity while celebrating their distinctive vocational genius as wives, mothers, entrepreneurs, scholars, or leaders—roles discerned through gifting and oriented toward love, not statistical sameness. Only then can policy avoid dehumanising women under the guise of empowering them.

7. Moral Evaluation of Outcome Parity

Metrics: Contemporary governance tools often evaluate progress by counting women's shares in legislatures, boards, and public offices. SDG Indicator 5.5.1 explicitly tracks the proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and in local government, and EIGE's Gender Equality Index aggregates domain scores with set weightings across work, money, knowledge, time, power, and health (UNSD, 2024; EIGE, 2017/2025). Composite indicators are useful for surveillance and benchmarking but carry technical risks: weighting choices, imputation, and aggregation can distort signals, and index rankings can be sensitive to methodological tweaks (OECD-JRC, 2008; Nardo et al., 2005). Such distortions also provoke spiritual malaise: when institutions rate righteousness by headcounts, they tempt members to envy differing callings and to despise their own (Gal 5:26). Frame (2017) cautions that justice metrics severed from vocation risk becoming "new legalisms" that neither honor grace nor promote

excellence. When a measure becomes a target (Campbell, 1979), Goodhart's and Campbell's laws predict gaming and mission drift that degrade the underlying good the metric was meant to track (Goodhart, 1975; Strathern, 1997; see also recent discussions of Campbell's law in research-assessment debates). A purely parity-based metric can therefore incentivize token appointments, coercive quotas, or the neglect of fit to vocation (UNSD, 2024; EIGE, 2017/2025; OECD-JRC, 2008; Lynam et al., 2024.).

8. Discernment and Spiritual Warfare:

Christians must guard against ideologies that reduce persons to categories or subordinate truth to targets. Scripture warns against conforming to this age and being taken captive by hollow and deceptive philosophies that are not according to Christ (Rom 12:2; Col 2:8). Spiritual warfare is real and operates through disordered loves and false measures (Eph 6:12). In Babel-like projects of homogenization, Scripture cautions against attempts to erase God-given distinctions for the sake of collective prestige (Gen 11:4–9). A gift-ordered ecclesial and civic practice resists both prejudice and metric fixation by seeking what edifies and serves.

9. Objections and Replies: A common objection is pragmatic: representation metrics are simple, cheap to collect, and correlate with some forms of inclusion. Indeed, UN custodianship for 5.5.1 emphasizes the feasibility and timeliness of electoral records, and parity indicators can reveal barriers and stagnation (UNSD, 2024; UN Women/UN DESA, 2024; World Bank, 2024). Yet simplicity does not guarantee validity. The OECD-JRC handbook cautions that composite indicators require transparency about weighting and sensitivity analyses to avoid spurious inferences (Nardo et al., 2005; OECD-JRC, 2008). Another objection appeals to equity: given historic discrimination, parity targets are needed to accelerate change. Evidence on mandated quotas, however, is mixed. In Norway, the 40 percent board quota produced large negative market reactions and younger, less experienced boards with some deterioration in operating performance (Ahern & Dittmar, 2012). Other work finds changed strategies, higher labor retention, and reduced short-term profits under quotas, suggesting complex trade-offs (Matsa & Miller, 2013). Meta-analyses on

gender diversity and performance report small average effects, often moderated by context and governance quality (Post & Byron, 2015; Pletzer et al., 2015; Wallrich et al., 2024). These findings support targeted barrier removal and process reforms rather than blanket outcome mandates. (UNSD, 2024; UN Women/UN DESA, 2024; Nardo et al., 2005; OECD-JRC, 2008; Ahern & Dittmar, 2012; Matsa & Miller, 2013; Post & Byron, 2015; Pletzer et al., 2015; Wallrich et al., 2024.).

10. Positive Framework for Just Institutions:

A gift-oriented framework aligns with both biblical teaching and robust public reasoning. First, secure equal dignity and impartial access by auditing entry barriers, advertising roles widely, using competency-based selection, and providing recourse mechanisms (Jas 2:1–9). Second, measure process integrity rather than only outcomes: document applicant pools, selection criteria, and the relation between competencies and mission. Third, evaluate institutional vocation and outputs against purpose-based criteria. OECD evaluation guidance provides a tested vocabulary for relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability that can be adapted to guard against metric drift (OECD-JRC, 2008; OECD, 2023). Finally, if composite indicators are used, follow best practice: publish data sources, weights, imputation rules, and sensitivity analyses, and avoid using indices directly as targets to minimize Goodhart effects (OECD-JRC, 2008; Goodhart, 1984; Strathern, 1997).

11. Case Application Revisited: Returning to the four-member committee: if all qualified persons had equal opportunity to stand and be elected, and if selection tracked necessary competencies for the institution's mission, a 100 percent female outcome is not a failure of justice but a success of discernment. Forcing male inclusion to satisfy a parity rule would instrumentalize individuals and risk lowering mission fitness. Justice in Scripture concerns rightly ordered relationships and stewardship of gifts, not symmetry of visible outcomes (1 Cor 12:7, 18–20; 1 Pet 4:10).

12. Methodological Note and Evidence Strategy: This article synthesizes secondary evidence across policy, measurement, and organizational outcomes. Source selection prioritized official indicator

metadata and handbooks for measurement validity, and peer-reviewed journals for empirical effects. To enhance transparency and reproducibility, I followed core PRISMA-2020 reporting principles for search, selection, and citation, while employing integrative synthesis rather than a single-design meta-analysis given the normative and interdisciplinary aims (Page et al., 2021; Sandelowski & Barroso, 2007). The approach triangulates UN and OECD documentation with economics and management studies and anchors theological claims in exegesis and Scripture (Page et al., 2021; Sandelowski & Barroso, 2007).

13. Implications for Church, Academy, Policy: For churches, resisting both partiality and parity mandates means cultivating discernment of gifts, encouraging candidacy from underrepresented but qualified members, and refusing tokenism. For the academy, research should prioritize barrier diagnostics, causal identification of interventions that expand access, and validity testing of indices, including sensitivity to weighting and to mission-relevant outcomes. For policymakers, SDG and regional dashboards can be retained as descriptive statistics if paired with process-integrity measures and with rigorous composite-indicator practice. Over the next decade, expect intensified reliance on dashboards; mitigating Goodhart effects will require publishing methods, commissioning periodic audits, and aligning incentives with mission-appropriate excellence rather than numerical symmetry (UNSD, 2024; OECD-JRC, 2008; UN Women/UN DESA, 2024).

14. Conclusion and Future Work: Justice, biblically and philosophically, is not reducible to counting bodies in seats. It is the impartial ordering of persons to God and neighbor, with institutions stewarding differentiated gifts toward the common good. Outcome parity can be just when it emerges from fair access and apt vocation, but it can be unjust when mandated at the expense of calling and competence. Future work should integrate barrier-focused administrative data with mission-relevant performance measures, test composite indicators for sensitivity and gaming, and develop theological-ethics curricula that train leaders in discerning gifts within congregations and organizations. By rooting equality in impartial access

and thankful stewardship of differentiated gifts, Christian communities can cultivate contentment rather than competition. Such gratitude-infused justice resists both prejudice and the Babel-like allure of enforced sameness, bearing witness to the Creator whose glory shines precisely through diversity rightly ordered to love (Sen, 1995; Roemer & Trannoy, 2015; OECD-JRC, 2008).

References

- Adams, R. B., & Ferreira, D. (2009). Women in the boardroom and their impact on governance and performance. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 94(2), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2008.10.007>
- Ahern, K. R., & Dittmar, A. K. (2012). The changing of the boards: The impact on firm valuation of mandated female board representation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1), 137–197. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjr049>
- Aquinas, T. (1274/1948). *Summa Theologica* (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Benziger Brothers. https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/03d/1225-1274,_Thomas_Aquinas,_Summa_Theologiae_%5B1%5D,_EN.pdf
- Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Assessing the impact of planned social change. Evaluation and Program Planning*, 2(1), 67–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189\(79\)90048-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189(79)90048-X)
- European Institute for Gender Equality. (2017/2025). *Gender Equality Index: Methodology and reports*. <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-equality-index> (methodology summary and updates) ([European Institute for Gender Equality](https://eige.europa.eu/gender-equality-index))
- Frame, J. M. (2017). *The doctrine of the Christian life*. P&R Publishing. <https://frame-poythress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/John-Frame-Doctrine-of-the-Christian-Life-Excerpt.pdf>
- Goodhart, C.A.E. (1984). Problems of Monetary Management: The UK Experience. In: Monetary

- Theory and Practice. Palgrave, London.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-17295-5_4
- Keller, T., & Alsdorf, K. L. (2012). *Every good endeavor: Connecting your work to God's work*. Penguin.
<https://www.gordonconwell.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2019/04/MM14.01TKellerK.AlsdorfEveryGoodEndeavorReviewErisman.pdf>
- Matsa, D. A., & Miller, A. R. (2013). A female style in corporate leadership? Evidence from quotas. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 5(3), 136–169.
<https://doi.org/10.1257/app.5.3.136> (*American Economic Association*)
- Nardo, M. et al. (2005), “Handbook on Constructing Composite Indicators: Methodology and User Guide”, *OECD Statistics Working Papers*, No. 2005/03, OECD Publishing, Paris,
<https://doi.org/10.1787/533411815016>.
- OECD (2023), *Toolkit for Mainstreaming and Implementing Gender Equality 2023*, OECD Publishing, Paris,
<https://doi.org/10.1787/3ddef555-en>.
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., et al. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Park, H. G., Qin, H. Y., Horne, R. M., Impett, E. A., Yorgason, J. B., & Cheung, F. (2025). Partner (in)congruence in gender-role attitudes and relationship satisfaction. *PNAS Nexus*, 4, pgae589.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae589>
- Piper, J., & Grudem, W. (Eds.). (1991). *Recovering biblical manhood and womanhood*. Crossway.
<https://document.desiringgod.org/recovering-biblical-manhood-and-womanhood-en.pdf?ts=1620230082>
- Pletzer, J. L., Nikolova, R., Kedzior, K. K., & Voelpel, S. C. (2015). Does Gender Matter? Female Representation on Corporate Boards and Firm Financial Performance--A Meta-Analysis. *PLoS one*, 10(6), e0130005.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130005>
- Post, C., & Byron, K. (2015). Women on boards and firm financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(5), 1546–1571.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2013.0319>
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice* (rev. ed.). Harvard University Press.
<https://giuseppicapograssi.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/rawls99.pdf>
- Roemer, J. E. (1998). *Equality of opportunity*. Harvard University Press.
https://archive.org/details/equalityofopport0000roemer/details/equalityofopport0000roemer?from_openlibrary_text
- Roemer, J. E., & Trannoy, A. (2015). Equality of opportunity. In A. B. Atkinson & F. Bourguignon (Eds.), *Handbook of Income Distribution* (Vol. 2A, pp. 217–300). Elsevier.
https://hceconomics.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/pdf/events/Roemer_Trannoy_2015_equality-opportunity.pdf
- Sangwa, S., & Mutabazi, P. (2025a). Compliance as the new competence: How obedience cultures erode innovation and leadership ethics in global workplaces. *Open Journal of Stewardship Economics & Ethical Innovation*. Vol 1(1). SSRN *Electronic Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5371035>
- Sangwa, S. and Mutabazi, P. (2025b). Lucifer's Operating System: Exposing the Spiritual Code of Global Governance. *Open Journal of Business Theology*. Vol 3(2). Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5344142>
- Sangwa, S. and Mutabazi, P. (2025c). Rights-Based Reforms and the Corporate-Cooperative Family Paradox: A Seven-Country Analysis of Marital Dissolution in Africa (1995-2025). Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5368174>
- Sangwa, S. and Mutabazi, P. (2025d). Mission-Driven Learning Theory: Ordering Knowledge and Competence to Life Mission. Available at SSRN: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5444156>
- Sen, A. (1995). *Inequality reexamined*. Harvard University Press; Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/0198289286.001.0001>

- Smalley, S. S. (1968). Spiritual Gifts and I Corinthians 12-16. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 87(4), 427–433. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3263304>
- Strathern, M. (1997). Improving ratings: Audit in the British university system. *European Review*, 5(3), 305–321. (Open copy) <https://gwern.net/doc/statistics/decision/1997-strathern.pdf>
- United Nations Statistics Division. (2024). *SDG Indicator 5.5.1 metadata: Proportion of seats held by women in national parliaments and local governments*. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/metadata/files/Metadata-05-05-01b.pdf>
- UN Women & UN DESA. (2024). *Progress on the Sustainable Development Goals: The gender snapshot 2024*. <https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2024/09/progress-on-the-sustainable-development-goals-the-gender-snapshot-2024>
- Vorster, J.M. (2019). The theological-ethical implications of Galatians 3:28 for a constitutional democracy. *In die Skriflig/In Luce Verbi*, 53(1), a2387. <https://scielo.org.za/pdf/ids/v53n1/37.pdf>
- Wallrich, L., et al. (2024). The relationship between team diversity and performance: A registered-report meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-024-09977-0>
- World Bank. (2024). *Gender Data Portal: Indicators and definitions*. Retrieved from: <https://genderdata.worldbank.org/en/indicators>